

FURTHER COMMENT ON *RANA MACULATA*. Z.N.(S.) 1750
(see volume 23, pages 169—173, volume 26, pages 119—120)

By James A. Peters (*Division of Reptiles and Amphibians, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.*)

The American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists has a permanent committee charged with the review of problems in nomenclature. In past years, the committee was polled for opinions on proposals before the International Commission on Nomenclature, and the committee opinion was submitted as a unit. Recently, the Nomenclature Committee of the Society was reorganized to consist of one herpetologist and one ichthyologist. Each is charged with soliciting response from members he selects to serve on an *ad hoc* committee dealing with a specific proposal within his field. I have therefore gathered opinions from interested herpetologists concerning the remarks by Sabrosky (1969, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 26 : 119—120) on the various methods of handling the proposal concerning *Rana maculata* Daudin, 1801.

The following herpetologists indicated support for alternative D as presented by Sabrosky: Carl Gans, Robert F. Inger, Alan E. Leviton, Neil D. Richmond, Douglas A. Rossman, and Jay M. Savage.

The following herpetologist indicated support for alternative A as presented by Sabrosky: Ronald Heyer.

Although not directly submitted to me as a response to *ad hoc* committee action, an additional comment on the question has been seen, and it would indicate that the following herpetologists would support alternative C as presented by Sabrosky: John D. Lynch and Hobart M. Smith.

I think it legitimate to add that the tenor of the letters received in response to my request clearly indicate the desirability of following the rules in cases such as these. Smith and Lynch, in their rebuttal of Sabrosky's points, indicate that the name *Rana maculata* Brocchi was used twice before 1959 and about half a dozen times since, and that the name *Rana macroglossa* was not used at all before 1941 and has been used about 20 times since. I have no reason to challenge these figures, but I do challenge the wisdom in submitting such problems to the Commission in the first place. Since actions within the limits permitted by the Code could have been taken that would have obviated the need to submit the proposal to the Commission, I think they should have been taken. I also support Sabrosky's alternative D, an action which achieves that end.

A COMMENT ON THE VALIDATION OF *MUREX LOTORIUM* LINNAEUS, 1758 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA) WITH AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL.
Z.N.(S.) 1886

By Walter O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland, New Zealand*)

In the proposal for a validation of *Murex lotorium* Linnaeus by A. G. Ben (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 26 : 174—176), the author omitted pertinent information which has a direct bearing on the case and the identity of the Linnaean taxon under discussion.

The original solitary reference given by Linnaeus (1758, *Systema Naturae*, (ed. 10) : 749) for *Murex lotorium* was to a figure in d'Argenville (1742, *L'Histoire Naturelle . . . la Lithologie et la Conchyliologie*, Pl. 13, fig. M). It is agreed that this figure represents the species *Murex pileare* Linnaeus, 1758.

In 1767 (*Systema Naturae*, (ed. 12) : 1217) Linnaeus repeated the erroneous d'Argenville reference cited with a query, but also added another reference to Rumphius (*Amboinsche Rariteitkamer*, Pl. 26, fig. B); the cited figure represents the *Cymatium lotorium* of authors. According to Dodge (1957, *Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.* 113 : 114), and verified by the writer, Linnaeus altered in his inter-leaved copy of